EXHIBIT B

Cassase37.07v-Q5039444SSC Document 2420-3 File 1905/25/26014pagage 2 pf 2



601 Lexington Avenue, Floor 54 New York, NY 10022 www.howrey.com

Ethan E. Litwin
Partner
T 212.896.6591
F 646.417.5692
litwine@howrey.com

May 24, 2010

Hon. Charles A. Legge JAMS Two Embarcadero Center Suite 1500 San Francisco, CA 94111

> Re: <u>Personal jurisdiction motions in In re Cathode Ray Tube (CRT)</u> Litigation, No. 07-05944-SC, MDL No. 1917

Dear Judge Legge:

I write on behalf of Philips Electronics Industries (Taiwan) ("PEIT") and Philips da Amazonia Industria Electronica Ltda. ("PAIEL") regarding the Report Regarding Case Management Conference that was issued on May 20, 2010 (the "Report"). In particular, I write to clarify the parties' agreement concerning my clients' pending Rule 12(b)(2) motions to dismiss the Consolidated Amended Complaints for lack of personal jurisdiction. The Report correctly notes that the parties have agreed to suspend all further briefing and argument on these motions until such time as either the direct or indirect purchaser plaintiffs decide to oppose said motions. In the interim, the parties will continue to meet and confer on the issue of personal jurisdiction in hopes of avoiding further briefing and argument on these motions altogether. Until such time as the parties reach an agreement, or otherwise elect to litigate the issue, the motions should remain pending so as to preserve my clients' objection to personal jurisdiction.

A copy of this letter has been shared with counsels for the direct and indirect purchaser plaintiffs, each of whom agrees with the foregoing.

Respectfully submitted,

Ethan E. Litwin

Counsel to PEIT and PAIEL

cc: All counsel via ECF